Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

a Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT ABANDONED UNAVOIDABLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(a)

Docket Number (Optional) 202 HQ

Karsten Brauer First named inventor:

1731 Group Art Unit:

Application Number:

08/897,713

Examiner: S. Vincent

Filed:

7/21/97

Title: PROCESS AND APPARATUS FOR THE PRODUCTIONS OF A

CYLINDRICAL COMPONENT OF GLASS

Attention: Office of Petitions

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

NOTE: If information or assistance is needed in completing this form, please contact Petitions Information at (703) 305-9282.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a timely and proper reply to a notice or action by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The date of abandonment is the day after the expiration date of the period set for reply in the Office notice or action plus any extensions of time actually obtained.

APPLICANT HEREBY PETITIONS FOR REVIVAL OF THIS APPLICATION

NOTE: A grantable petition requires the following items:

- Petition fee; (1)
- Reply and/or issue fee; (2)
- Terminal disclaimer with disclaimer fee--required for all utility and plant applications filed (3)before June 8, 1995, and for all design applications; and
- Adequate showing of the cause of unavoidable delay

| 1. | Petiti | on | fee |
|----|--------|----|-----|
|----|--------|----|-----|

| BOH I | 66 | 4 4=400 | | antity status |
|-------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| : T | nall entity - fee \$ | (37 CFR 1.17(1)). | Applicant claims small | entity status. |
| E. Sr | mail entity - lee v | | • | |
| | oo 37 CFR 1.27. | | | |

 \blacktriangle other than small entity - fee \$\frac{110}{} (37 CFR 1.17(I)).

2. Reply and/or fee

| sebià augua iee | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| A. The reply and/or fee to the | above-noted Office action in Amendment | (identify the type of reply): |
| has been filed previou is enclosed herewith. | ısly on | <u> </u> |
| B. The issue fee of \$ has been paid previo is enclosed herewith. | usly on | · |

[Page 1 of 3]

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 1.0 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on burden mour Statement: This form is estimated to take 1.0 hours to complete. This will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments of the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS.

01/07/2003 SLUANG1 00000009 08897713

01 FC:1452

110.00 GP

JAN 0 8 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS



PTO/SB/61 (10-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S.

| U. Orange State of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a | a collection of information unless it displays a valid office |
|--|--|
| U. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a | TENT ABANDONED |
| | IEM ADAME |
| UNAVOIDABLY ONCE with disclaimer fee | ter June 8, 1995, no terminal disclaimer is required. 1.20(d)) of \$for a small entity of \$ red period of time is enclosed herewith (see at the entire delay in filing the required reply from ition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable, is |
| I hereby certify that this correspondence is being. | ents establishing unavoidable delay R TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)] See on the date shown below with sufficient postage as assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box DAC, Below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Signature Steven M. Hoffberg Typed or printed name of person signing certificate |



HQ 202

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants

Karsten Bräuer, et al.

Serial No.

08/897,713

Filed

July 21, 1997

For

1

PROCESS AND APPARATUS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF A

CYLINDRICAL COMPONENT OF GLASS

Group Art Unit

1731

Examiner

S. Vincent

December 31, 2002

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED

DECLARATION OF STEVEN M. HOFFBERG IN SUPPORT OF PETITION TO REVIVE UNAVOIDABLY ABANDONED PATENT APPLICATION

JAN 0 8 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Applicant's records for this case do not show any evidence of receipt of an Office Action Dear Sir: dated June 15, 1999. It was believed by Applicants around that time, that Applicant's Response to Office Action mailed April 19, 1999, and apparently received on April 22, 1999, was a sufficient response to the outstanding Office Action dated March 18, 1999, and Office Action dated September 2, 1998.

Because the Office Action dated June 15, 1999 was apparently not received, no response thereto was submitted. Apparently, the Notice of Abandonment dated October 1, 1999 was also not received by our office.

ĺ

Applicants have included a copy of a manually maintained record card relating to this case, which is used to record the existence of outstanding requirements from the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, as well as the respective due date. Applicant's electronic records, which constitute a parallel docket system, are generally updated and no archive copy is maintained, however, a review of printed documents from around this time period did not reveal any outstanding requirement. Any such requirement would have been brought to the attention of the responsible attorney. It is our office policy to docket U.S. Patent and Trademark Office correspondence immediately upon receipt, which is then distributed to the responsible attorney for further review and action. The failure to indicate both of these Actions on the manually printed card indicates that these were <u>not</u> received in the normal course of business. A review of our records for the physical correspondence also failed to reveal any such records.

The attorney originally in charge of this application, Mr. Kenneth E. Macklin, is now deceased. However, our office generally maintains all of his patent files.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the application became unavoidably abandoned as a result of failure to receive the correspondence dated June 15, 1999, and Applicants delay in seeking to revive this application was a result of failure to receive the Notice of Abandonment dated October 1, 1999.

It is unclear how, and indeed quite surprising, that two consecutive correspondence in this case, apparently accurately addressed, would fail to be received by our offices, and indeed our records of other cases appear to indicate a low incidence of misdirected or otherwise not received correspondence. Notwithstanding, it is respectfully submitted that both of these documents, if

properly received by our office, would have been opened by our firm staff and properly docketed, including making an entry on the manual card entry system and electronic docket system prior to distribution to Mr. Macklin, and therefore, no explanation is available from us regarding the ultimate disposition of these documents.

We believe it would be unfair and unjust to penalize our client by holding abandonment of this application under these circumstances, and respectfully request that Applicants Petition to Revive the application be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. Hoffberg Reg. No. 33,511

MILDE & HOFFBERG, LLP 10 Bank Street – Suite 460 White Plains, NY 10606

(914) 949-3100

j



Lorud: 7-21-97 5N 08 897 713

Lorud: 1-21-97 5N 08 897 713

Lorud: 1-97 5N 08 897 713

Lorud: 1-97 7-18-97

Lorud: 1-97 7-18-97

Lorud: 1-97 7-18-97

Lorud: 1-97 7-18-97

Lorud: 12-18-97

Lorud: 12-18-98

Lorud: 12-18-98

Lorud: 12-198

Supply nucles 12-1-98

Esp to Comm: 4-18-99 4-19-99

comperedad veritid with original
12/21/02
ABW 1/k/
12/33,511



Here 202 FEF Path 2 Led: 7-27 SN 08/897713 Lessed: to clast 7: 7-97 march Leger to clast 7: 7-97 march Leger to Clast 7: 7-97 (See 20:00 dig) Dec + DA One: 9-21-57 (See 20:00 dig) Dec + DA One: 9-21-57 (10-57) LIU Dec: 11-30-98 11-30-98 LIU Dec: 11-30-98 Logy to Comme 4-19-99 Perp to Comme 4-19-99

RECEIVED

JAN 0 8 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS